DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 056 116 UD 010 763

AUTHOR King, George D.
TITLE A Special In-Service Training Institute for the Preparation of Teachers for Effective Service and Leadership in Desegregated Schools. Final Technical Report.
INSTITUTION Paine Coll., Augusta, Ga.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 20 May 67
GRANT OEG-2-7-000244-2720
NOTE 14p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Differences; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Institutes (Training Programs); *Intergroup Relations; *Race Relations; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS Georgia

ABSTRACT

The participants for the Institute consisted of well-experienced classroom teachers from representative secondary schools in Georgia and South Carolina. There were a total of 40 teachers and counselors. It was felt that these teachers would experience, for the first time, the need to concern themselves with the socio-cultural backgrounds of diverse pupils. Moreover, these teachers lacked the necessary preparation for guiding pupils toward an understanding of the eclectic characteristics of a society because of a lack of experience in intergroup relations. This training program was designed in order to remedy these gaps in teacher preparation. The Institute was held on Saturdays between January 4, and March 17, 1967. (Author)

10763
NCRIEEO
Cat.

FINAL TECHNICAL REPORT

ED056116

A SPECIAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS FOR EFFECTIVE SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP IN DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

AUTHOR: Dr. George D. King

CONTRACT NUMBER OEG2-7-000244-2720

PROGRAM DIRECTOR: Dr. George D. King

PAINE COLLEGE

AUGUSTA, GEORGIA

The Project Reported Herein Was Supported by a Contract from the

U. S. Department of Health, Educaction

and

WELFARE

OFFICE OF

EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION.POSITION OR POLICY.

UD 010 763

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

Mark S. Adams
Schofield High
Aiken, S. C.

Lee N. Beard
T.W. Josey High
Augusta, Georgia

Mildred S. Brown
Schofield High
Aiken, S. C.

Eloise K. Curtis
Sand Bar Ferry Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Rosemary English
Schofield High
Aiken, S. C.

Susan K. Gross
Wilkinson Garden
Augusta, Ga.

Helen A. Snelling Hampton
A.R. Johnson Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Mildred W. Hankerson
T. W. Josey High
Augusta, Ga.

Martha L. Harden
Langford Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Helen V. Henry
Sand Bar Ferry Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Cyrus W. Hickson, Jr.
A. R. Johnson Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Henry H. Jackson, Jr.
Butler High
Augusta, Ga.

Johnnie Jackson
Laney High
Augusta, Ga.

Ruth E. James
T. W. Josey High
Augusta, Ga.

Harold G. Johnston
Butler High
Augusta, Ga.

Sara H. Jones
Butler High
Augusta, Ga.

Henry C. Jordan
T. W. Josey High
Augusta, Ga.

Ola Kennedy
Schofield High
Aiken, S. C.

Margaret L. Laney
A.R. Johnson Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Patricia A. Lawrence
Sego Hr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Annette S. McFadden
Sand Bar Ferry Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Johnny Moore, Jr.
A.R. Johnson Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Carlton Morris
Sand Bar Ferry Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Jamie H. Overton
Butler High School
Augusta, Ga.

Leslie J. Pollard
Blanchard Consolidated
Grovetown, Ga.

Lester O. Pollard
Blanchard High
Appling, Ga.

Iris B. Powell
Laney High
Augusta, Ga.

John E. Preacher, Jr.
T.W. Josey
Augusta, Ga.

Quincy L. Robertson
Laney High
Augusta, Ga.

Rose H. Sanders
A. R. Johnson Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Jean T. Searcy
Sego Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

William W. Self
T. W. Josey
Augusta, Ga.

Yvonne J. Shaw
Laney High
Augusta, Ga.

Sadie P. Smith
A.R. Johnson
Augusta, Ga.

Amy M. Thompson
Murphy Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Ernestine H. Turner
Sand Bar Ferry Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Cherie G. Waddey
Sego Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Grace Ward
Sand Bar Ferry Jr. High
Augusta, Ga.

Arthur Williams
T. W. Josey High
Augusta, Ga.

Ida L. Williams
C. T. Walker
Augusta, Ga.

A. CONTENT:

This particular Institute was designed to provide expert training for 40 Secondary School teachers and counselors who were working in integrated or soon to be integrated schools. They were, for the most part, well-experienced teachers and counselors. It was felt that these teachers would experience for the first time the need to concern themselves with the socio-cultural backgrounds of diverse pupils. Since all of their previous experiences had been under conditions of racially segregated schools, there had been no real necessity for understanding experiences that each ethnic or social group brings to the learning situation. Moreover, it was felt that these teachers lacked the necessary preparation for guiding pupils toward an understanding of the eclectic characteristics of a society made up of diverse elements each of which contributes to the enrichment of the whole through common sharing and personal growth. These gaps and tendencies, relative to teacher preparation and lack of experience in intergroup relations, affect, in a significant way, the ease with which school desegregation is accomplished and the extent to which white and Negro pupils are fully integrated into a constructive classroom and school atmosphere.

1. OBJECTIVES:

It was in the light of the above framework that the Paine College Institute proposed to accomplish the following objectives:

(a) To develop basic understandings and clearer concepts about the relationship between the Democratic Ideal and an integrated society.

(b) To assist participants to gain a better understanding of problems related to public school desegregation and some techniques on how to attack them.

(c) To develop basic understandings about the impact of segregation on the development of human potentialities.

(d) To develop understandings of problems and characteristics of impoverished communities and the nature, cause and effects of cultural deprivation as it relates to levels of achievement.

(e) To develop basic understandings and professional skills and techniques with which to cope effectively with persistent problems arising from integration in public schools.

(f) To familiarize the participants with the use of newer curricular materials, contents and approaches helpful in preparing youth to function as citizens in a multiracial society.

2. Frequency and Duration of Training Session:

This was an in-service Institute which was held on Saturdays between January 14, 1967 and March 17, 1967. A total of twenty training sessions were involved. Because Easter and the Masters Golf tournament intervened in this period--two days which Augustans simply reserve for their own personal predilections--we met for four three-hour sessions on Wednesdays to make up for those two Saturdays. Courses were taught during periods of one and one-half hour duration with fifteen minutes allowed for coffee breaks; i.e. two lectures and discussion periods of one hour and fifteen minutes duration were held each morning. The afternoon was devoted to problem analysis sessions. At this time the group was subdivided into four small discussion groups by having the participants to count from one through four in consecutive order. This procedure was used to insure the bi-racial character of each group since, at the outset, all of the white and Negro participants persisted on segregating themselves in their seating arrangement in the general lecture sessions. A staff member was assigned to each discussion group. When there were special lecturers they circulated between each of the groups, giving equal time to each group. Each group chose a discussion leader and a recorder. This was done on a democratic basis and the positions rotated. This gave the participants and opportunity to see themselves, as well as to have others evaluate them, in leadership roles. On the afternoon of each fourth Saturday the small group sessions did not meet. All the participants assembled in the general lecture room where the recorder for each group reported on the discussions and the findings of his group for the preceding three Saturdays. This procedure provided the opportunity for a lively exchange between groups. We were able to further the interaction process through rotating the personnel make-up of the groups--a lesson we learned from the first Institute. A Civil Rights attorney, Mr. John Ruffin, was employed to be available each training day for private conferences with the participants. This was a wise decision; for participants, for one reasen or the other, were reluctant to raise questions concerning their personal problems in the general or the small group. On the other hand, they felt no compunction about talking to Mr. Ruffin privately about their fears and problems within their own school system. Again, this was an extremely useful technique.

3. Procedures:

a. Topics for the Institute courses and group and individual projects were developed around the following:

(a) The Democratic Ideal and modern American society and their relationship to modern educational philosophy.

(b) Effect of deprivation on the development of intelligence and human potentialities.

(c) Working with the culturally disadvantaged.

(d) The development of instructional materials designed to promote democratic inter-group living.

(e) Civil rights, the Guidelines, and the teacher.

4. Methods:

a. Source materials from a broad spectrum of American life and culture was made available for use by the participants. Moreover, selected readings from well-recognized social scientists were given the participants for study and discussion. These materials were extremely helpful in correcting some of the stereotypes held by each group about the other and aided them tremendously in arriving at new value definitions based on recent research. In the small group discussions emphasis was placed on the inductive approach.

b. Dr. Joseph Awkard, of Florida A&M University, and Dr. David Day, of Emory University, acquainted the participants with recent and relevant research on the effect of deprivation on the development of intelligence and human potentialities. Through the use of typical aptitude and intelligence test, they exposed the fallacious assumptions about Negro potentialities. Demonstrations were conducted to explore "test bias" and show ways of developing human potentialities in the classroom.

c. A field trip was made to the Sportsman's Boat Club private lake reservation in May. We held our regular lecture sessions in the Club House in the morning. On that particular day, Dr. William Couch professor of English at North Carolina College at Durham, and Duke University, presented a masterful talk on the "Democratic Aspects of Modern American Literature." His ease of manner, facility with the English language, poise, looks, and general self-confidence captured the imagination and interest of the group. For lunch the participants had "chipped in" and paid a local restaurant to prepare their menu. The participants had elected

a bi-racial committee to arrange for the luncheon and activities for the afternoon. The luncheon was served in smorgasbord style.

In the afternoon, various games were organized for those who wished to play games. In addition, several of the members of the Boat Club made their boats available for boat rides. We observed a kind of social interaction between the races that would have heretofore been considered impossible in the social milieu of the Augusta professional community. Never before had Negro and white teachers in the CSRA area interacted in a social situation, of this nature, on an equal basis. We feel that this experience was of inestimable value in breaking down barriers between the races and smashing long-standing stereotypes and prejudices held by both groups. We feel that more of these kinds of experiences should be provided for in future Institutes.

d. The Director held informal discussion sessions for small bi-racial groups in his home in the afternoons following the formal training phase. These groups were rotated to eventually include each member of the Institute At these sessions the participants talked informally with the Director, staff members, special lecturers, and each other. Unquestionably, these session afforded the participants an opportunity to see themselves interacting socially in a manner which three months earlier would have been considered obnoxious social and class behavior. It is true, however, that the Director was the object of a good deal of criticism from the Negro and white communities for inviting inter-racial groups into his home. The results, however, greatly outweighed the criticisms suffered by the Director. It is recommended that this procedure be continued in future Institutes.

e. On May 17, the last day of the Institute, a formal banquet was held at our most exclusive hotel, for the participants. This provided another opportunity for social interaction within the group. It was heartening to observe the progress the group had made in this respect. They sat together, ate together, chatted together freely and uninhibited. This would have been impossible on the first Saturday. A formal banquet as a close-out activity is recommended for future activities.

B. Evaluations:

1. All participants were given F. Stuart Chapmen's Social Insight Scale, Bernard's Neighborhood Practice Schedule, and Bosworth's Community Attitude Scale.

2. Individual staff members were assigned to each of the small groups to determine conceptions and misconceptions brought to the Institute by participants and used these discussions as reference points so that the participants could determine their own progress during the Institute.

3. During the Institute, short-term objective tests were given to examine the participants on their knowledge of the content material taught under "Procedures" above. We were happy to find that none of the participants "failed" these test.

4. Techniques utilized to evaluate the degree to which the participants translated the content materials into effective approaches to intergroup relations and pedagogical difficulties included the following:

   (a) Small group discussion with instructional and/or consultant staff;

   (b) Self-evaluation of performance or behavior in intergroup behavior;

   (c) Evaluation of participants by one another relative to various intergroup activies--role playing, etc;

   (d) The administration of Robert E. Bill's Index of Adjustment Values Scale and Keppler's Attitude Adjustment Inventory.

C. Selection of Participants:

1. Participants for the Institute consisted of well-experienced classroom teachers from representative secondary schools in Georgia and South Carolina. There were a total of 40 teachers and counselors.

2. Announcements and brochures on the Institute were sent to Superintendents, Principals, and teachers in the various school districts.

3. Selection of the teachers and counselors was based on the background of applicants as indicated on application forms, recommendation from principals and superintendents, and the prospect of being transferred into a desegregated situation.

4. A committee of the Institute faculty selected the participants.

D. All participants in the Institute were enrolled full-time pursuing work that yielded the equivalent of three (3) semester hours of credit. All participants who chose not to register to receive credit were required to register for 3 semester hours of non-credit work in the Institute.

No participant was enrolled for part time, i.e. for less than the twenty days, one day a week (Saturdays) from January 11 thru May 20. The schedule was constructed to allow ample time for laboratory work, research and individual study during the Institute day.

E. Materials:

A comprehensive library was established exclusively for Institute participants. This library included films, books, paperbacks, journals and articles. Among the materials were:

1. A bibliography listing about 500 books, articles, pamphlets, case studies and pamphlets dealing with desegregation.

2. A list of films dealing with school desegregation and/or human relations

3. Educational materials on compensatory training of deprived groups, history of civil rights movements in the United States, philosophy of education in a democratic society, group dynamics or group process in a democratic society.

F. Special Administrative and Service Requirements:

Since the Institute was held on Saturdays there was no provision requiring them to eat or live on campus. Moreover, all of the participants lived within commuting distance of the college.

G. Participants Reaction:

1. On the post-evaluation questionnaire the participants were asked to reply to eleven questions regarding the Institute.

The Questionnaire and a tabulation of the results follows:

1. Organization of Institute

78% Well Organized
20% Adequate, but could be better
2% Inadequate, organization detracted from Institute
_____ Confuded and unsystematic

2. Preparation of Each Lecturer

92 Majority showed definite evidence of careful preparation.
5 Majority showed some preparation
3 Material not always clear in lecturer;s mind
_____ Majority not well prepared

3. Attitude Toward Classroom Desegregation

51 My attitude toward desegregation in classrooms has changed since attending
4 My attitude is the same concerning classroom desegregation since attending
35 My attitude has changed to a certain degree, but not completely concerning desegregated classes
_____ I did not want to change my attitude, as it was already desirable
____

4. The Institute's Ability to Encourage Thinking

78 Was very helpful in making one think
22 Was considerable stimulating to thinking
_____ Not much stimulation to thinking
_____ Discouraging to thought

5. Staff's Attitude Toward Students

94 Sympathetic, helpful, actively concerned
4 Moderately sympathetic
2 Routine an attitude; most staff members avoided individual contact with students
_____ Distant, aloof, cold

6. Fairness in Examinations

64 Testing excellently done
30 Testing was satisfactory
6 Testing sometimes unfair
_____ Testing mostly unfair

7. Social Interaction within the Institute

14 Very little change in attitudes and very little social interaction as a result of the Institute

24 Moderate change in attitudes and social interaction

59 Definite evidence of social interaction

3 No social interaction

8. Would you Consider Attending Another Institute of This Type?

98 YES

2 NO

9. Attitude Toward the Institute

1 Regret applying to Institute

91 Enjoyed the Institute and really feel that it was helpful

8 Did not enjoy the institute

10. Tolerance to Disagreement (Institute)

2 Students and staff members encouraged reasonable disagreements

96 Students and staff accepted disagreement fairly well

2 Discouraged disagreement

____ Most persons were dogmatic, intolerant and disagreeable

11. After Attending the Institute

76 I feel that I could work harmonously in an integrated setup

19 I feel that I could work in an integrated setup, if I had to

3 I still prefer not to work in an integrated setup

1 Would not work in an Integrated setup

2. Some brief comments from the participants:

"This Institute helped me in removing doubts or reservations I had toward working with other racial or ethnic groups."

"I have thoroughly enjoyed the Institute. It has helped me to see both sides of the desegregation issue. I will not be as intolerant of other opinions."

"If possible, try to have sessions of this Institute until you have had the majority of the teachers (both races) in attendance. H.E.W. will not have to worry about violations of the guidelines. There will be less violations."

"As stated before, I believe, the Institute has been beneficial in that my beliefs about Negroes have been changed. I have learned to respect them as a race. I didn't think I had any prejudice but realized I did and probably still do."

"Has awakened me to the seriousness of the problem. I was a big talker about desegregation, but didn't know 1/3 of what I should have of the problem."

"The Institute was very good in that it helped me to learn to communicate with everyone present regardless of his race. I never before realized this difference existed to the extent that it actually does."

H. Follow-up

This was the least successful segment of the program. There was little difficulty in getting the Negro participants to cooperate in a thorough follow-up program, but there was no participation on the part of the white participants. They were not ready, as of yet, to invite members of the Institute's staff to counsel with them at their schools. There was still a good deal of fear about "What my colleagues will say." There is evidence, however, that this attitude is softening. Furthermore, it appears that one or possibly two, meetings in which the entire group would be invited back to the campus for consultation and advice would be preferable to the individual conferences at the respective schools. It is doubtful, however, whether this plan would be successful without the provision of a stipend for that (or those) days. This approach is strongly suggested.

I. Observations:

1. The small group sessions went well, but they did pose some problems for the staff member who was assigned to the group. The strong emotional problems involved in understanding and dealing with racial problems and creating greater understanding between races make it difficult for the staff member to maintain a mature and objective viewpoint which can keep him in a helping relationship rather than taking sides on particular issues with subgroups of the total group. Participants are extremely conscious of subtle cues from a staff member, or group leader, which are evaluative in nature of different participants. Thus it is easy to consciously or unconsciously to squelch or encourage members in such a way that authenic communication is effectively inhibited. This problem was recognized early and all staff members were so informed.

2. The eagerness of most participants in the Institute was both obvious and heartwarming. It was particularly encouraging to observe and participate in still more in-depth conversations of practical approaches to handling classroom situations, subject matter presentations, etc., in the small bi-racial group sessions held in the Director's home there was evidence of still more "loosening up" on the part of the participants.

3. There was a great deal of rapport between the staff and the participants and a definite feeling that the Institute existed for the participants, not the staff. There was a relaxed exchange of ideas between the staff and participants and each was free to question and disagree with the other.

Results and Conclusions

The Institute was able to sensitize a large number of the participants through the program described. Many stereotypes previously held by each group about the other were exposed as fallacious. For the first time, Negro and white school teachers interacted in both a social and professional situation on an equal basis. Many prejudices were exposed and participants were made aware of the sensitivities of each other. Consequently they showed a much higher degree of tolerance for individual differences that had not been apparent at the outset.

The staff recognized, however, that while many of the participants expressed the willingness to work across racial lines a close tie-in had to be made with the administration if school systems of institutes were going to become effective arrangements for supporting desegregation efforts of school systems. While individual teachers might be willing to cross racial lines, their desires can be, and were in many cases, thwarted by the reactionary and segregationist views of school superintendents.

It was also the feeling of the staff that the follow-up procedure should be changed. First, because it consumed too much time on the part of the staff; secondly, the entire Institute population could not be covered with the time and expense alloted; and thirdly, it was a waste of government money for staff members to be traveling over the state to see one, two or three persons a day.